

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 23 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, as failing to comply with the written description requirement and rejected claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. In response, claims 23 and 24 have been cancelled and claims 1, 4, 10, 17, and 22 have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. It is therefore respectfully requested that the Examiner's rejection be withdrawn.

Applicant wishes to point out that the Examiner indicated that claims 1-22 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Therefore, in view of the above amendments, it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issuance.

Should the present claims not be deemed adequate to effectively define the patentable subject matter, the Examiner is respectfully urged to call the undersigned attorney of record to discuss the claims in an effort to reach an agreement toward allowance of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 31, 2006

By:

Richard A. Giangiorgi, Reg. No. 24,284

James R. Foley, Reg. No. 39,979

Attorneys for Applicant

TREXLER, BUSHNELL, GIANGIORGI,

BLACKSTONE & MARR, LTD.

105 West Adams Street, 36th Floor

Chicago, Illinois 60603-6299

Tel: (312) 704-1890

922417.WPD

Serial No.: 10/718,435

Art Unit: 1753

Page 6